

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. 2784 LIAO3030/EM/7087 09/917,751 07/31/2001 Wen-Yih Liao EXAMINER 07/20/2004 23364 7590 ANGEBRANNDT, MARTIN J **BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE** PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 1756

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/917,751	LIAO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Martin J Angebranndt	1756
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
THE REPLY FILED 06 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application application () a timely filed amendment whicles	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>06 July 2004</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:		
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);		
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);		
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or		
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The 112 rejections are withdrawn.		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .		
Claim(s) rejected: 30-49.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) applied applied on is a)	roved or b)□ disapproved by tl	he Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<u> </u>
10.⊠ Other: pto-892 citing applicant provided reference		11 thr
		Martin/J Angebranndt Primary Examiner Art/Unit: 1756

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner ahs adderessed these issues previously, particularly pointing out the benefits of making the modifications suggesteed by the examiner and their basis in the prior art fo record. Clearly, the TCNQ anion acts as a quencher/stabilier for cyanine dyes in general and is an improvement over acid anions. The advantages of 4-methoxycarbonylbenzyl moiety on the nitrogen of cyanine dyes is clearly taught by Liao et al. and as the dyes in the claimed mixtures are cyanine dyes, they would be expected to benefit from the use of TCNQ anions. With respect to the desirability of one of the dyes in the mixture having different N substitutents, this assymetry is clearly taught as desirable by Sato et al. for cyanijne dyes based optical recording media. Moreover, each of the exact benefits asserted by the applicants are already recognized in the one of the references applied. Therefore the benefits cannot be considered unobvious. The art rejections stand. The comparasions are not even with the closest prior art and only reasserts known advantages from the prior art applied.